

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION – CINCINNATI**

MARGARET D.,	:	Case No. 1:20-cv-390
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Judge Matthew W. McFarland
	:	Magistrate Judge Stephanie K. Bowman
v.	:	
	:	
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL	:	
SECURITY,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION (Doc. 43),
OVERRULING OBJECTIONS (Doc. 46), AND TERMINATING CASE**

This action is before the Court on Magistrate Judge Stephanie K. Bowman’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 43). Magistrate Judge Bowman recommends that Defendant Commissioner’s motion to dismiss (Doc. 25) be dismissed. Plaintiff objects (Doc. 46). This case is ripe for the Court’s review.

In her objections, Plaintiff advances the same arguments she made in opposition to the motion to dismiss. (*Compare* Doc. 41 at 6-7 *with* Doc. 46 at 3-4.) Specifically, she argues that the Commissioner is obligated to notify certain state agencies that she was a Disabled Adult Child beneficiary. But the magistrate judge considered this argument and others at length before rejecting it. (*See* Doc. 43 at 4-8.) Plaintiff does not explain why she believes the magistrate judge was mistaken.

Objections to magistrate judges’ reports and recommendations are not meant to be vehicles for rehashing arguments that the magistrate judge has already considered.

Nickelson v. Warden, Chillicothe Corr. Inst., No. 1:11-CV-00334, 2012 WL 700827, at *4 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 1, 2012). Such objections fail to identify any specific errors in the report and recommendation. *Owens v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 1:12-CV-47, 2013 WL 1304470, at *3 (W.D. Mich. Mar. 28, 2013). Rather, they effectively duplicate the functions of the district court “as both the magistrate and the district court perform identical tasks. This duplication of time and effort wastes judicial resources rather than saving them, and runs contrary to the purposes of the Magistrates Act.” *Howard v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991).

Nonetheless, as required by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), the Court has made a de novo review of the record in this case. Upon review, the Court finds that Plaintiff’s objections are not well-taken and are accordingly **OVERRULED**. The Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 43) in its entirety and **TERMINATES** this matter from its docket.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

By: 
JUDGE MATTHEW W. McFARLAND